

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application, with claims 1-11 being independent. Claims 1-11 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention.

As an initial matter, a telephone interview was conducted on February 10, 2009 in the subject application. Participating in the interview were one of Applicants' representatives (Raymond DiPerna), the Examiner (Angelica Ruiz), and the Examiner's supervisor (Mohammad Ali). The undersigned representative agrees with the summary set forth in the Interview Summary mailed on February 20, 2009. During the interview, both the formal rejections and the prior art rejections were discussed. While no agreement as to allowability was reached, the Examiners requested that the undersigned attorney submit the claim amendments and arguments in written form so that such claim amendments and arguments can be fully considered. Accordingly, submitted herewith are claim amendments and arguments similar to those discussed during the interview. The Examiners are kindly thanked for participating in the interview. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

At paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-11 were objected to for including numbers enclosed in parentheses. To facilitate prosecution, Applicants have canceled such recitations from the claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in paragraph 9 of the Office Action. It is noted that these claim changes were discussed during the interview and the Examiners indicated that such

changes would likely overcome this rejection. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent Application US 2002/00138290 A1 (hereinafter “Kishimoto”) in view of “IBM Technical disclosure (User Logon Profile, August 1991) (hereinafter “IBM”); claims 2 and 12, as being obvious from Kishimoto in view of IBM and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0102491 A1 (hereinafter “Yamamoto”); and claims 7, 8, and 11, as being obvious from Kishimoto in view of IBM and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0138504 (hereinafter “Yano”).

Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 11, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Kishimoto is understood by Applicants to relate to an information processing apparatus having (1) a function to automatically transfer an “application program” from an inner storage to an external server, when there is not enough vacant area to download a new application program from the external server into the storage, and (2) a function to automatically re-transfer the “application program” from the external server to the inner storage, when the new application program is completed. Therefore, the aim of Kishimoto is to temporally obtain an area with enough space to store a new application program.

In the claimed invention, in stark contrast, (1) user data is automatically transferred and deleted from a data storage unit of an information processing apparatus to an external storage device, when a logged-on user who has produced the user data executes a logoff procedure, and (2) the user data is automatically re-transferred from the external storage device to the data storage unit, when the logged-on user who has logged off tries to log on

again. The aim of the claimed invention is to ensure security for user data in the apparatus to which multiple users can log on alternatively. Accordingly, the inventive concept of the claimed invention is distinguishable from the cited art.

Notably, in claim 1, multiple users are prevented from logging on simultaneously. Therefore, once one user logs on, other users cannot log on until that user logs off. The claimed invention can ensure security of the user data for a particular user by transferring the data from the data storage unit (e.g., 110) to the external device (300) after a specific user logs off, and transferring the data back after that user logs on. In this way, the security of each user's data can be ensured despite the fact that multiple users can log on to the information processing apparatus separately.

This is different from Kishimoto. First, as noted, the aim of Kishimoto is to free up memory space in its inner storage so that it can make room for a new application program. To that end, Kishimoto transfers its application program from its inner storage to its external server when the inner storage does not contain enough space to accommodate the application program. This can be seen from the abstract and, for example, at paragraph 0114 of Kishimoto. Paragraph 0114 in particular is cited in the Office Action at page 8, in connection with the “saving unit” of claim 1. Paragraph 0114 of Kishimoto states:

The saved-information storage unit 136 is a storage member which is used for saving data from the D-RAM 24 employed in the information-processing apparatus 1 in accordance with a request made by the information-processing apparatus 1 in case the D-RAM 24 does not have a sufficient free area for installing a new application program... (Emphasis added.)

However, the “saving unit” of amended claim 1, in stark contrast, includes “a saving process of copying and thereby saving the saving object file or files into an external storage device via a network regardless of an amount of available memory space in the data storage unit.”

At page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner states:

The aim for Kishimoto is not solely to temporarily obtain enough vacant area to store new application programs; it is also to authenticate the user that receives the “application programs” and “data files.”

However, first, even though a user may be “authenticated,” Kishimoto still only transfers the application program (and any data files relevant thereto) from its inner storage to its external server when the inner storage does not contain enough space to accommodate the application program. Kishimoto does not transfer the data from its inner storage to its external storage regardless of the amount of available memory space in the inner storage. In fact, as seen from paragraphs 0106 and 0118, Kishimoto logs users onto the server (not to the information processing apparatus as in the claimed invention), and once a user is logged on to the server in Kishimoto, the user can receive services rendered by the server. Also, as noted previously, in Kishimoto an “application program” in the storage of the information-processing apparatus 1 is transferred to the external server 130, but “data files prepared or renewed based on tasks by said logged-on user” are not transferred.

The IBM document does not supply what is missing from Kishimoto. While IBM discusses loading only one User Logon Profile (ULP) in the system memory at any point in time (page 1, lines 19-20), a ULP merely provides a way to associate a list of pre-defined users with each local user ID (page 1, lines 9-10). A ULP contains user IDs and passwords for specific remote destinations, remote nodes, and/or Logical Units (Lus) (page 1, lines 10-12). Each 4-tuple consists of a user ID, a password, a remote type, and a remote name (page 1, lines 12-13). Accordingly, while IBM discusses loading the user’s logon profile into the system memory when the local user logs on, and removing the user’s login profile from the system memory when the user logs off, the user’s logon profile is merely for the purpose of logging the user into local or remote workstations or nodes; the user’s logon profile does not include “data files prepared or renewed based on tasks by said logged-on user as a saving object file or files,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, nothing in Kishimoto or IBM, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination (if any) would teach or suggest “a saving unit, executing, when said logged-on user executes the logoff procedure, a saving object recognizing process of recognizing, from among data files stored in the data storage unit, all or a predetermined portion of data files prepared or renewed based on tasks by said logged-on user as a saving object file or files, a saving process of copying and thereby saving the saving object file or files into an external storage device via a network regardless of an amount of available memory space in the data storage unit,” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, nothing in the cited references would teach or suggest “a restoring unit, executing, as necessary after a specific logged-off user executes another logon procedure, a restoring process of referencing the management information and thereby copying and restoring the saving object file or files, saved in the external storage device, into the data storage unit, such that the saving object file or files prepared or renewed based on tasks by said specific user are present in the data storage unit only when said specific user is logged on,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is seen to be clearly allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 11 recites features which are similar in many relevant respects to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, claim 11 is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in

condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, she is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RAD', is positioned above a horizontal line.

Raymond A. DiPerna
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 44,063
Tel. No. (212) 708-1950